



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,043	12/11/2003	Valerie M. Bennett	RSW920030296US1	8736
43168	7590	06/02/2009	EXAMINER	
MARCI A. DOUBET LAW FIRM PO BOX 422859 KISSIMMEE, FL 34742			SAEED, USMAAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2166			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/02/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/734,043	Applicant(s) BENNETT ET AL.
	Examiner USMAAN SAEED	Art Unit 2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4, and 26-28 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/22/2009

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/02/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,766 B 2) in view of Sathyanarayan (U.S. Patent No. 6,691,106 B1).

As to claim 1, Thomson et al. discloses a computer-implemented method of programmatically building a query user interface to build a query command to query content of a Web page, wherein the webpage lacks a query user interface, further

comprising (See column 17, lines 12-35, wherein "lacks a query user interface" implies no data is available until the report is generated according to user's query definition):

programmatically determining, based on the specified content values, a plurality of content types corresponding thereto (see column 5, lines 61-67, column 13, lines 28-41);

using the programmatically-determined current context and at least one of the programmatically-determined content types to consult a lookup component which obtains at least two query parameter names to display on the programmatically-built query user interface (See column 7, lines 1-19 and figure 9, wherein "query parameter name" is taken to be a column heading);

programmatically identifying, for each of the obtained query parameter names, at least one selectable query qualifier corresponding thereto, wherein each of the selectable query qualifiers indicates a particular comparison to be performed when subsequently qualifier usable in selected ones of the content values to that query parameter name (See column 17, lines 12-35);

programmatically identifying, for each of the obtained query parameter names, at least one selectable parameter value usable corresponding thereto (See column 17, lines 35-45, wherein a query condition is built);

programmatically building a plurality of query parameters by associating, with each of the obtained query parameter names, each of the at least one programmatically identified selectable query qualifiers corresponding thereto and each of the at least one

programmatically-identified selectable parameter values corresponding thereto (See column 7, lines 1-19); and

displaying on the query user interface, for each of the programmatically-built query parameters, the obtained query parameter name, a first selector for selecting one of the at least one query qualifiers associated therewith and a second selector for selecting least one of the at least one parameter values associated therewith (See column 13, lines 20-25, wherein "for selecting" is interpreted as intended use and it is suggest that it is replaced with "to select", and wherein "query parameter name" is taken to be a column heading); and

accepting input from the user to build the query command to query the Web page, further comprising (See column 13, lines 28-35):

accepting, from the user for each of at of the displayed query parameter names, one of the associated query qualifiers selected by the user with the first selector and at least one of the associated parameter values selected by the user with the second selector; and programmatically building the query command to specify, for each of the displayed query parameter names, the selected query qualifier and each of the at least one selected parameter values (See column 26, lines 5-30, and wherein "query parameter name" is taken to be a column heading).

Thomson et al. teaches the claimed invention but does not specifically teach: programmatically determining a current context of a user of a device on which the Web page is rendered, the current context comprising *at least one of*:
an identification of the user;

a role of the user;
the device used by the user; and
a geographical location of the user;
programmatically determining a plurality of content values specified in the Web page.

Sathyaranayanan teaches programmatically determining a current context of a user of a device on which the Web page is rendered (see column 7, lines 5-15), the current context comprising at least one of:

an identification of the user;
a role of the user;
the device used by the user; and
a geographical location of the user; (See column 6, lines 2-9, and see column 7, lines 5-15);
programmatically determining a plurality of content values specified in the Web page (See column 5, lines 4-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Thomson et al. by the teachings of Sathyaranayanan to include programmatically determining user's device location for better and more accurate rendering of display results and ease of data customization.

Claims 27 and 28 are essentially the same as claim 1 except that they set forth the claimed invention as a system and a computer program product and are rejected for

the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

As to claim 4, Thomson et al. as modified discloses further comprising:

programmatically identifying at least one query extension parameter for the query command, responsive to a request from the user using the programmatically-determined current context and at least one of the obtained query parameter names to consult a mapping, thereby obtaining a related query parameter name (See Thomson et al. column 13, lines 20-25, and see Sathyaranayanan column 9, lines 1-10);

programmatically identifying at least one selectable query qualifier corresponding to the obtained related query parameter name, wherein each of the selectable query qualifiers indicates a particular comparison to be performed if subsequently comparing selected ones of the content values to the obtained related query parameter name (See Thomson et al. column 13, lines 20-25, wherein "if" is conditional phrase and should be replaced with "when", and see Sathyaranayanan column 8, lines 21-36);

programmatically identifying at least one selectable parameter value corresponding to the obtained related query parameter name (See Thomson et al. column 18, lines 1-24, wherein "name" is in fact the source of the data); and

programmatically building the query extension parameter by associating, with the obtained related query parameter name, the programmatically-identified at least one selectable query qualifier corresponding thereto and each of the at least one programmatically-identified selectable parameter values corresponding thereto (See Thomson et al. column 6, lines 44-67); and

wherein the displaying further comprises also displaying the programmatically-built query extension parameter for each of the at least one programmatically-identified query extension parameters as additional ones of the programmatically-built query parameters (See Thomson et al. column 6, lines 44-67).

As to claim 26, Thomson et al. as modified discloses programmatically determining preferences of the user and wherein the using the programmatically determined current context and at least one of the programmatically determined content types further comprises using the programmatically determined preferences of the user to consult the lookup component (See Thomson et al. column 5, lines 61-67, column 13, lines 28-41, column 7, lines 1-19 and figure 9 and See Sathyaranayanan column 6, lines 2-9, and see column 7, lines 5-15).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 03/02/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In these arguments applicant relies on the amended claims and not the original ones.

Applicant argues that Thomson and Sathyaranayanan do not teach or suggest "programmatically building a query user interface to build a query command to query content of a Web page, wherein the webpage lacks a query user interface."

In response to the preceding arguments, first of all examiner would like to point out that that applicants specification does not contain any description of building a query user interface and wherein the webpage lacks a query user interface. As described in paragraph 0048 of the specification and figures 8-11, applicant only describes populating query user interface with parameter values and/or candidate extensions. Therefore examiner equates the populating query user interface to build a query user interface.

In view of this interpretation Thomson et al. teaches programmatically building a query user interface to build a query command to query content of a Web page, wherein the webpage lacks a query user interface, further comprising (See column 17, lines 12-35, and column 6, lines 44-58). Therefore, Thomson teaches populating of graphical user interface to build a query based on the context of a user and wherein lacks a query user interface is interpreted as unpopulated query user interface.

Further applicant argues that Thompson and Sathyanarayan do not teach or suggest "an identification of the user; a role of the user; the device used by the user; and a geographical location of the user."

In response to the preceding arguments examiner respectfully submits that Thomson teaches "an identification of the user; a role of the user; the device used by the user; and a geographical location of the user" as extracted context is passed along with the target report. Metadata about the report includes, for example, a unique name

or identifier, location of the originating client, originating and target data sources and associated rules (See column 7, lines 8-11).

Further, Sathyaranayan teaches “an identification of the user; a role of the user; the device used by the user; and a geographical location of the user” as the current user profile 140 is generated to produce the following information: (1) current interest category (based on pages visited, user clicks, text typed, etc.); (2) current user location, appointment status; and (3) the user’s current goal (through detection of user interest, current category of browsing) (See column 6, lines 2-9, and see column 7, lines 5-15).

Therefore both of the references disclose the location of the user.

Contact Information

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to USMAAN SAEED whose telephone number is (571)272-4046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Usmaan Saeed/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166
May 25, 2009

Usmaan Saeed
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2166

/Hosain T Alam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166